

**REMARKS**

Applicants have amended claims 2, 17, and 21 to more appropriately define the present invention, and added new claims 23 and 24 to protect additional aspects of the present invention. Upon entry of this Amendment, claims 1-24 remain pending and under current examination.

**Regarding the Office Action:**

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 2 and 17-21 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, 2nd paragraph, as being indefinite; rejected claim 21 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, 4th paragraph, “for not incorporating by reference all of the limitations of the claim [to] which it refers” (Office Action, p. 2); indicated claims 18-20 would be allowable if rewritten or amended to overcome the 35 U.S.C. § 112, 2nd paragraph, rejection, and to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims; and allowed claims 1, 3-16, and 22. Applicants traverse the rejections for the following reasons.<sup>1</sup>

**Rejection of Claims 2 and 17-21 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, 2nd paragraph:**

The Examiner alleged that these claims are “indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention” (Office Action, p. 2). The Examiner alleged there is insufficient antecedent basis for the limitation “polycrystalline layer” in the rejected claims.

To advance prosecution, Applicants have amended claims 2, 17, and 21. Claims 2 and 17 have been amended to delete reference to “polycrystalline” that was the basis for the Examiner’s

---

<sup>1</sup> The Office Action may contain statements characterizing the related art, case law, and the claims. Regardless of whether any such statements are specifically identified herein, Applicants decline to automatically subscribe to any statements in the Office Action.

rejection. Claim 21 has been amended to independent form, also eliminating any antecedent basis issues.

The amendments to claims 2, 17, and 21 overcome the 35 U.S.C. § 112, 2nd paragraph, rejection. Accordingly, Applicants request withdrawal of the rejection of claims 2 and 17-21, and an indication that they are now allowed.

**Rejection of Claim 21 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, 4th paragraph:**

The Examiner rejected claim 21 “for not incorporating by reference all of the limitations of the claim [to] which it refers” (Office Action, p. 2). The Examiner alleged “[c]laim 21 has a negative limitation of [] a polysilicon layer in place of the amorphous layer. The amorphous layer is a limitation the dependent claim refers to in the independent claim 1, hence this limitation cannot be eliminated from dependent claim 21” (Id.).

To advance prosecution, Applicants have amended claim 21 to independent form, which, among other things, deletes the negative limitation “in place of the amorphous layer.”

The amendments to claim 21 overcome the 35 U.S.C. § 112, 4th paragraph, rejection. Accordingly, Applicants request withdrawal of the rejection of claim 21, and an indication that it is now allowed.

**Conclusion:**

In view of the foregoing, Applicants request reconsideration of the application and withdrawal of the rejections. Pending claims 1-24 are in condition for allowance, and Applicants request a favorable action.


If there are any remaining issues or misunderstandings, Applicants request the Examiner telephone the undersigned representative to discuss them.

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this response and charge any additional required fees to our deposit account 06-0916.

Respectfully submitted,

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW,  
GARRETT & DUNNER, L.L.P.

Dated: September 12, 2005

By:   
David M. Longo  
Reg. No. 53,235

/direct telephone: (202) 408-4489/